

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 25 are pending in the application. No claim amendments are presented, thus no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-7 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Aotake (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,771).

Briefly recapitulating, Claim 1 relates to an information processing apparatus with a recording unit configured to record a first supplied picture and a reproducing unit configured to reproduce a second recorded picture. A display controlling unit provides display control which causes a first user interface to be displayed when the recording unit records the first picture supplied and to display a second user interface when the reproducing unit reproduces the second picture recorded. Further, the first and second user interface share a recording button through which a user can input orders for operating the recording unit and a playback button through which a user can input orders for operating the reproducing unit.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus, comprising:

... wherein said first and second user interfaces share a **recording button** through which to input orders for operating said reproducing unit and a **playback button** through which to input orders for operating said reproducing unit.

The outstanding Official Action asserts that Aotake teaches all the elements of Claim

1. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Aotake describes a picture processing apparatus which uses screen change parameters to capture still images representative of various points and recorded image.<sup>1</sup> Figs. 7-8 of Aotake depict a plurality of user interfaces that are displayed when operating in the record

---

<sup>1</sup> Aotake at abstract.

mode to record a supplied picture; and Fig. 15 depicts a user interface displayed when a moving video image file is reproduced.

As clearly depicted in Figs. 7-8 and 15 of Aotake, the record interface and reproduction interface fail to share a **recording button** through which input orders for operating said recording unit and a **playback button** through which to input order for operating the reproducing unit, as recited in Claim 1.

The outstanding Official Action states:

when the "Slipclip" item is clicked by operating the mouse 22, five items representing application program, namely, "slip recorder", "clip editor", "clip viewer", "video CD copy tool" are displayed on the screen (see Figs 1, 2 and 5; mouse 22; col. 23, lines 15-23), and, for example, in order to carry out a slip playback operation, the user selects a "slip" item from a "playback" menu (see col. 35, lines 9-25). It is, therefore clear that the mouse 22 (input means) and display means (see display apparatus 51 of Fig. 5) are used in shared interface means during the recording and playback processes.

However, the comments in the outstanding Official Action fail to address the above-noted features recited in Claim 1. Specifically, a displayed first user interface for recording and a displayed second user interface for reproducing share both a **recording button** and a **playback button** through which orders can be input. The outstanding Official Action appears to equate a pull down menu in a generic user interface to an interface displayed while recording a picture and reproducing a picture. However, Claim 1 specifically recites that a first user interface is displayed **when** the recording unit records the first picture supplied and a second user interface is displayed **when** the reproducing unit reproduces the second picture recorded. Therefore, these two interfaces correspond to those depicted in Figs. 7-8 and 15, respectively, of Aotake when a user interface is presented allowing a user s to record and playback specified video clips.

Clearly, the interface depicted in Figs. 7-8 and Fig. 15, of Aotake, fail to share a **recording button** through which to input orders for operating the recording unit and a

**playback button** through which to input orders for operating the reproducing unit, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn. For substantially the same reasons as given with respect to amended Claim 1, it is submitted that independent Claims 5, 7 and 25 also patentably define over Aotake.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-7 and 25 is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
ATH:smi

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\20's\203722-US\203722US-RESP 6-29-05.DOC